

THE
D I V I N I T Y
Of our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST
PROVED FROM THE
H O L Y S C R I P T U R E S,
BY ALEX. SIMPSON, D. D.
MINISTER of the PROTESTANT DISSENTING
CONGREGATION of Bondgate, in Alnwick.

IN ANSWER to a PAMPHLET
In which this DOCTRINE is denied,
ENTITLED,
STRICTURES on a DISCOURSE
Preached in the PARISH CHURCH of ALNWICK,
On Whitfunday, 1788.

Including Thoughts on the Nature of CHRIST,
And a Disquisition on some of the popular
Opinions concerning that Point.

In a Letter to the Rev. Mr. JOHNSON, Curate of Alnwick,

BY R A T I O N A L I S.

GOD said I am. Ex. 3. 14.
JESUS said I am. JOHN 8. 58.

Printed for the AUTHOR, by T. Alder, and
sold by A. Graham, Bookseller, in Alnwick.
MDCCLXXXVIII.

THE

DIVINITY

OF THE LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST

PROVED FROM THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES

BY NEEZ SIMPSON, D.D.

LECTURER AT THE LONDON STANT DISSIDENT

CONGREGATION, in London.

IN ANSWER TO A

LETTER FROM A LADY



PRINTED

STATIONERS OF A DISCOURSE

PREACHED IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF ALDINGHAM

ON THE 10TH OF SEPTEMBER, 1811.

AND PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR, ON THE 10TH OF SEPTEMBER,

1811. IN A SMALL PAMPHLET.

OF WHICH A COPIY IS HEREBY

SENT TO THE LONDON STANT DISSIDENT CONGREGATION.

BY R. A. L. O. N. A. L. S.

FOR THE AUTHOR, BY NEEZ SIMPSON, D.D.

LECTURER AT THE LONDON STANT DISSIDENT

CONGREGATION, in London.

PRINTED BY A. GORDON, STANT DISSIDENT

CONGREGATION, in London.

TO the good Christians of all
Denominations in the town of
Alnwick, the following little piece in de-
fence of the Divinity of our Lord and
Saviour JESUS CHRIST, is with due
respect addressed by,

Their humble Servant,

ALEX. SIMPSON, D. D.

*Minister of the Protestant
Dissenting Congregation
of Bondgate, Alnwick, in
the county of Northumber-
land.*

14

of all

of the

of the

of the

of the



ALEXANDER D.D.

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,

S OON after my return from Scotland a few weeks ago, I was informed that a Pamphlet had been in circulation for some time in this place, containing horrid blasphemy against our Redeemer. A copy was put into my hand by a worthy friend, with some remarks on its pernicious tendency, and desiring at the same time that I would write an answer to it. Having glanced at the contents in a very cursory manner, the arguments adduced against the divinity of our Saviour appeared to me so inconclusive, that I thought it unnecessary to attempt a refutation of them.

But soon after this, other judicious Christians who have opportunities of observing the hurtful effects produced by performances of this nature on the minds of the young, the ignorant, the weak, and the unguarded, urged me to take it under my consideration, and publish an answer.

At last I began to consider of gratifying their wishes, and having found that the Rev. Mr. Johnson does not intend to take any notice of this performance in the way of publication, I have at last yielded to importunity; and determined to throw this little mite of service into the hands of the public, in support of so glorious a cause.

Nor do I wish to despair of convincing Rationalis himself (if he shall think proper to give me a candid hearing) that the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is supported by the clearest testimony of the Sacred Writings. For I remember some years ago, a lady of great capacity, and considerable reading on religious subjects, told me, she was so fully convinced that there could be only one person in the divine nature, that unless she was unmad and had a new kind of understanding given to her, she could not see how it was possible for one to convince her that Jesus Christ was a divine person; and therefore like Rationalis she told me she was hurt at the expression, the blood of God, and could never become a member of any church where such expressions were used in divine worship. Yet this same lady by a careful attendance on the expounding of the holy Scriptures, and comparing spiritual things with spiritual, came at last through the good hand of God upon her to be fully convinced that Jesus was God over all blessed for ever, and joined as a member of our Church, where we gloried in the ideas and language of the Apostle Paul, Feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood. At the same she admitted that though she could not but believe this as a truth upon the evidence of infallible testimony, she (like all the rest of men) could not understand how three persons are in one indivisible essence. And who can tell but Rationalis treading in the same steps of impartial enquiry, and aided by him who hath said, If any

man will do his will he shall know of the Doctrine whether it be of God, may become a sincere convert to that very Doctrine which he now calls heresy ; though at present like Saul of Tarsus, he verily thinks with himself, that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.

I propose to treat my subject in the following manner. 1st, Fairly to state, and (I hope) fully to refute the arguments of Rationalis against the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

2d, To show in a concise manner the unscriptural nature of the other positions interspersed by Rationalis in his performance, which seem worthy of notice.

3d, Point out some of the uses that may with propriety be made of what is written, in the execution of this little work.

Some of the ideas of Rationalis on the subject of our Lord's divinity, are expressed by him page 4th, in the following words, " This Doctrine as appears to me is totally repugnant not only to revelation and the clearest passages in the Bible, but also to reason and common sense."

Again, in page 14th, we have these words, " There is not a single passage in the Bible that

“gives the least hint that he was to be of any
“other than the human nature.”

His first argument if I mistake not lies in page 7th of the *Strictures*, &c. and is when stripped of extraneous matter concisely to this purpose.

“The 147th Pf. from which Mr Johnson took
“his text was none of David’s Psalms, but was
“composed in the time of the prophet Daniel,
“and hath respect to the return of the Jewish
“nation from the Babylonish captivity. That the
“Psalmeft calls upon the Jews who acknowledg-
“ed no other Lord than Jehovah the creator of
“the world to praise him for so great a deliver-
“ance, nor had they any idea of there being any
“other object of their worship and adoration.”

Answer. It is of no consequence as an argu-
ment against the divinity of our Lord Jesus, to
observe that this Psalm is none of David’s Psalms,
because a Psalm may be David’s and yet the di-
vinity of Christ may not be the subject of which
it treats; and it may not be David’s and yet
contain evidence of this doctrine, since no rea-
son can be assigned why other inspired writers
might not write of this subject as well as that
great prophet and king.

It is readily admitted, that the Jews after the re-
turn from their captivity acknowledged no other
Lord than Jehovah the creator of the world,
but this is no argument against our Lord’s divi-

say, unless it could be shewn that he was nei-
 ther Jehovah nor Creator. Then indeed the ar-
 gument would be conclusive; but if on the other
 hand Jesus is Jehovah and was the creator of all
 things, this reasoning of Rationalists not only falls
 to the ground, for the purpose for which it is
 brought, but is evidence as certain as demon-
 stration itself in behalf of the divinity of Christ.
 That he is Jehovah shall be afterwards proved.
 That he was the creator of all things, the fol-
 lowing passage of scripture, as well as many others
 shews beyond any reasonable ground of doubt.
 JOHN 1, 2, 3. 10. 'In the beginning was the
 word, and the word was with God, and the
 word was God. The same was in the beginning
 with God. All things were made by him, and
 without him was not any thing made that was
 made. He was in the world and the world was
 made by him.' Our author adds, 'Neither had
 they any other idea of their being any other ob-
 ject of their worship and adoration.'

If the ideas of the Jews were just, they be-
 lieved to be according to the revelation which
 the supreme Being gave of himself. He instruct-
 ed them that he was One. 'Hear, O Israel, the
 Lord our God is one Lord.' He instructed them
 also that in him there was more than One in
 such a sense as that One could speak to
 another. Gen. 1, 26. 'And God said let US
 make man in OUR image. Isaiah 6, 8. ALSO

I heard the voice of the Lord saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for US. The Lord told the Jews by the mouth of the prophet Zechariah, about fifty years before Cyrus issued his proclamation for the building of the house of God, and for the return of the Jews, that he had a man who was his fellow. Zech. 13. 7. 'Awake O sword against my shepherd, and against the man my fellow.' According to Rationalis this Pt was probably the joint production of Ezra and Nehemiah. It would be very uncharitable to suppose that they had not views of God, according as he represented himself by his prophets. Though therefore they had no idea of any object of worship but Jehovah, it is I think but fair from the premises above to infer they understood Messiah to be the Father's fellow, or equal (not as man surely,) but as the son of God, and therefore possessing the same divine nature as his Father. A relation to him which he claimed in the days of his flesh, and for claiming which the Jews said he made himself God. John 10, 33. It is therefore reasonable to believe, that they acknowledged him as the object of their adoration as well as the Father.

The next argument of Rationalis is in page 12 in the following words :

"It is such a doctrine as if persisted in by christians, would for ever be a bar to the conversion of the Jews to the christian faith. But as that event is expressly foretold in several passages

“ of the holy scriptures, and will therefore of
 “ certainty be accomplished in due time, there
 “ can be no doubt of that position being at length
 “ abandoned, and that the pure doctrine of the
 “ word of God will finally and universally pre-
 “ vail.”

To this I reply, As the conversion of the Jews to christianity is foretold, it must have its accomplishment. And if God has said that this doctrine must be abandoned in order to this great event it will take place also; ‘For faithful is he that hath promised’ If therefore Rationalis can point out chapter and verse for this purpose, it shall be duly attended to. But his saying that it must be so, is no proof that it will be so. Nay, if any credit is due to the testimony of Jehovah himself, we are warranted on the contrary to believe that when they are converted to christianity, they will consider Messiah whom they crucified as Jehovah as well as man.

For in the 12th ch. of the prophet Zechariah, we have Jehovah himself foretelling the conversion of the Jews in the following language. Jehovah also shall save the tents of Judah. first, that the glory of the house of David, and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem do not magnify themselves against Judah. In that day shall Jehovah defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David, and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them.

And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem. Now please to observe, without any change of the speaker it is added, ' And I will pour upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon me (Jehovah) whom they have pierced (namely as man) and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first born.'

As to the little story of Rationalists in support of this argument, respecting the displeasure of the Jewish Rabbies at the Romish clergy, for calling Mary the Mother of God, the whole of its force lies either in a misrepresentation of the fact on the part of the clergy, or a misconception of the truth on the part of the Rabbies. Protestants who believe in the divinity of their Saviour, think as well as Jews that it is impossible that he as God could have a mother. This, reason, philosophy, and common sense, as well as the holy scriptures all conspire to teach; but that he that was born of Mary, according to the flesh, is also God, we are warranted to believe while it stands upon record. Matth. 1st, 23d. ' Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted, is God with us.'

This observation serves at the same time to show that Rationalists either mistake or wilfully mispre-

sents preachers as blasphemers when they use the expression *The Blood of God*. We believe that God is a spirit, without flesh and blood, but at the same time is in such intimate union with humanity in the person of Jesus Christ, that we are commanded to feed the flock of God carefully, from this consideration "He hath purchased the church with his own blood. Acts 20. 28." From this it appears that it is warrantable to use the expression, unless it can be shewn that the blood of God, and God's own blood mean different things.

Another argument of Rationalis to disprove the divine nature of Jesus Christ, is in the following words. "With what astonishment and indignation would they (he means the Jews) hear of Jehovah the God of their Fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: the Lord of Hosts and Creator of the world, being debased to the condition of a man, to the suffering of an ignominious death? Would they not tell you that the Messiah, according to all the prophecies that had ever been uttered concerning him, was to be one of their own nation of the seed of David according to the flesh, and therefore a real natural man consisting of flesh and blood like themselves? How ridiculous and shocking to a well informed mind must that doctrine appear, which teaches that the Almighty and Infinite Spirit, that gave being to every creature, and that sustains, animates, and pervades the whole creation, throughout the boundless

" regions of space, came down from heaven and
 " assumed the form and nature of a man, was
 " born into this world in a state of helpless in-
 " fancy, and like other children increased in wif-
 " dom and stature, and after remaining a few
 " years on this globe, was at length put to
 " death by a combination of ignorant and aban-
 " doned mortals."

To this declamatory argument, I oppose the
 following observations. Every christian who
 believes in the divinity of Jesus and understands
 the subject, agrees with Jews and with every
 well informed mind, That it is impossible Jeho-
 vah can be debased that is changed from God
 into a creature. For he is Without variableness
 or any shadow of turning. If this be the doc-
 trine which Rationalis sets himself to oppose, it
 is a figment of his own imagination; not an arti-
 cle of our belief. But — he means in this rea-
 soning to deny that Jesus was Jehovah as well
 as man, then we contend that neither the indig-
 nation and astonishment of Jews, nor the ri-
 dicule it may excite in well informed minds, are
 sufficient proofs against it. Fact has no depen-
 dence on opinion or treatment. It continues the
 same let men think of it or conduct themselves
 towards it as they please. As to the indignation
 of the Jews, that was foretold, and therefore is
 rather in favour of than against our doctrine.
 Matt. 21st, 42. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye
 never read in the Scriptures, The stone which
 the builders rejected the same is become the head
 of the corner. This is the Lord's doing, and it is
 marvellous in our eyes.

But what was the cause of this indignation? Was it because he gave out himself to be only a man as Rationalis would have him to be? Let the Jews themselves answer this question John 10 chap. 33 ver. 'The Jews answered him saying, for a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou being a man makest thyself God.'

As to that part of the argument, 'That enlightened minds would ridicule and be shocked at this doctrine;' till once an infallible criterion is established by which we can know the truth or falsehood of a proposition, by the treatment which men are pleased to give it, we ought to be very cautious in pronouncing upon evidence of so precarious and fluctuating a nature. The Greeks in the days of the Apostle Paul were a very enlightened people, yet he tells us the preaching of Christ crucified was to them foolishness; that is a subject of ridicule, but to them that were saved it appeared a glorious display, both of the wisdom and power of God.

To Aristotle the prince of intellectual philosophers, it appeared impossible that even God himself could produce matter out of nothing. For it was a first principle in his improved understanding, Out of nothing, nothing can be made. He behaved therefore to ridicule the doctrine of Moses. 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The doctrine of providence was heartily laughed at by Epicurus, because it

appeared to him unbecoming the dignity of the divinity to concern himself with the little affairs of men. But what appeared impossible to Aristotle, and ridiculous to Epicurus, is in the view of Rationalis philosophically just. The truth is on subjects of intuition, it may be safe to pronounce independent of particular information, because these must remain invariably the same; but in facts that depend upon the goodness and wisdom and will and power of God to cause, it is certainly wise for christians to do in religion, as philosophers do in matters of science. Having seen the folly of establishing a system of principles first, and explaining the phenomena of nature by them, at last, they laid this method aside, professed they knew nothing, applied themselves to the examination of nature, and from experiment, observation, and fact, established the theory of truth.

In this manner the rational subjects of God's moral government on earth ought to conduct themselves in matters in which they are infinitely more interested, 'For what is a man profited if he should gain the whole world and lose his own soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?' Men's opinions concerning what is becoming God to do independent of his own information, have been so various and contradictory that it seems the more informed and the better cultivated any mind is, the more it will be convinced of the wisdom of coming in the conscious

ignorance of a little child to learn from God himself what is competent and becoming him to do for accomplishing the most important of all his works with which we are acquainted, the salvation of his people. It is readily acknowledged, that Jehovah united to humanity is a subject of the highest astonishment; Great is the mystery of godliness God manifested in the flesh was the devout exclamation of the astonished Apostle Paul! But is it for this reason impossible? No man is warranted from reason or the holy scriptures to say so.

May I be allowed to say, after all the attention that I have ever bestowed upon the subject, I find I am as much at a loss to understand how an act of power could bring the worlds of mind and matter out of nothing into being, as I am to understand how there can be three persons, The Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit in one essence; or how he who pervades and sustains all his works through the boundless regions of space, should be united to a human body and soul, that is, I understand neither the one nor the other. Yet it is submitted, whether it is not infinitely more becoming a wise man to believe their truth upon the evidence of revelation, than to disbelieve them, because some men may think proper to treat them with indignation, ridicule, and contempt.

Rationalis gives us another argument, which if true, must be acknowledged a conclusive one indeed. It is at the top of page 15th of his Stric-

tures, in the following words. "This tenet was
 "never so much as thought of by any of the
 "Patriarchs or Prophets in the Old Testament,
 "or by any of the Disciple or Apostles of Christ
 "in the New, and would undoubtedly have been
 "rejected by them with the utmost indignation
 "and abhorrence."

You see, good christians, Rationalis is one of the bold spirits in his way. He scorps to mince matters, and roundly tells his readers, not only how heartily he rejects this doctrine himself but also how indignantly it would have been treated by the best of men who lived thousands of years ago. His manner puts one in mind of the spirit of Saul of Tarsus, when he punished oft in every Synagogue them that called on the name of Jesus, and compelled them to blaspheme, and being exceedingly mad against them, persecuted them even to strange cities. Oh! Rationalis, Rationalis, why blasphemest thou Jesus of Nazareth? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. But this is expostulation. I return therefore to the consideration of the argument. My intelligent reader will please to observe it is all mere assertion, and assertion of a very extraordinary nature.

I have read of the great knowledge of Solomon, and of men who had a gift of discerning spirits, but such a man as Rationalis professes to be, I never saw: Of such a man I never read. A man that knows all the thoughts of all the Patriarchs, of all the Prophets of the Old Testament, and of all the Disciples and Apostles of

Christ in the New; and, moreover, knows how they would all have been affected with the hearing of a doctrine, and how they would have treated it. For unless he knows all these matters how can he take upon him to affirm so peremptorily concerning them? Would it not be better to assert modestly and prove evidently, than to assert confidently and prove nothing? Is it true the assertion is followed up with several other assertions which we never deny, namely, that Jesus is a man; That he died and rose and was highly exalted, and will finally be subject to him that put all things under him; but the scriptures teach us a great deal more. Here we are informed That Jesus Christ has all the names given to him which are given to the only true God. Here we find him often called Jehovah Adonai Elochim Kurios Theos, names by which the supreme being is often marked out in the oracles of truth. Here we find many of the titles of God ascribed to him. Here we find that the incommunicable perfections of Godhead belong to him. Here we are instructed that he created all things, and that by him all things consist. Here we find him claiming and receiving on earth and in heaven that worship which none but the supreme God hath a right unto. In these inspired writings we find Jesus himself informing us that it is the will of him that sent him, That all men should honour the Son **EVEN AS** they honour the Father. What shall I add, here we find Jehovah the Father (who is jealous of his honour and who punished men so often for giving that

homage to creatures which belonged to him) commanding all the Angels of heaven to worship him.

But least Rationalis should say all this is mere assertion, be pleased to attend to a few quotations from these Prophets and Apostles who according to him never had a thought of the truth of such a doctrine, and then judge how far his testimony is deserving of credit.

Before I proceed to this, I candidly acknowledge the names Elochim Adonai in the Old Testament, and the names Kurios Theos in the New are given to angels and superiors among men, as well as to the true God, and therefore if we had nothing more than the application of these words to Jesus to prove his divinity they would by no means be conclusive. But as in arithmetic though four cyphers signify nothing, yet place the figure 1 before them, and then you have ten thousand; so here place the incommunicable name Jehovah before these, and then you have as it were ten thousand demonstrations that is evidence as certain as demonstration, that Jesus Christ is a divine person. For it is carefully to be attended to, that the supreme being represents himself in the holy scriptures as jealous of all the rights which belong exclusively to him. So jealous that he tell us; Jealous is one of his names. Exodus 34, 14. For thou shalt worship no other God for Jehovah whose name is JEALOUS is a jealous God. Of these rights the name Jehovah is one. Isaiah 42, 8. 'I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory will

I not give to another.' The word signifies The BEING who was, and is, and is to come, possessing all being, perfection and blessedness by a necessity of nature. The Psalmist understood that this was a name incommunicable to any other Being. Ps. 83, 8. That men may know that thou whose NAME ALONE IS JEHOVAH art the most high over all the earth. And the Jews to whose trust the oracles of God were committed, were so careful of not applying this name to any inferior object whatever; that in order to avoid the profanation of it, as the word Jah composed of the Hebrew letters Jod and He, is an abbreviation of this name; and as Jod in their numeration stands for 10, and the letter He for 5, they use the letter Teth which signifies 9, and the letter Vau which is used for 6, making up in this manner the number 15.

Now be pleased to carry along with you these ideas of the incommunicable name and jealousy of God, and the care which the Jews took not to apply this sacred name improperly, and then attend to a few passages of scripture. Isaiah 6 from the beginning, "In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord, (Adonai) sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the Seraphims, each one had six wings, with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another and said, Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory, and the posts of the doors moved at the

voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke. Then said I woe is me for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips, for mine eyes have seen the king the Lord of hosts (Jehovah Tzabaoth)." Even Rationalis himself cannot deny that it was the supreme God whom the Seraphim praised here, and whose glory Isaiah saw. Compare this with John 12 ch. from the 37 to the 41 verse inclusive, and we shall find it was the glory of Jesus which Isaiah saw. "But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not in him. That the saying of Isaiah the Prophet might be fulfilled which he spake, Lord who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed. Therefore they could not believe, because that Isaiah said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spake of him."

Again. Isaiah 40, 30. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord (Jehovah) make straight in the desert a highway for our God." That by the voice here we are to understand John the Baptist, and by Jehovah our God, Messiah, The inspired historian Matthew informs us, Matth 3 ch. from the beginning, "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judea, And saying repent ye, for the kingdom of hea-

ven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Isaias saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord and make his paths straight."

If language is of any use in conveying ideas to the mind of man, these passages are sufficient to shew that the incommunicable name Jehovah belongs to Jesus Christ. In other words he is Jehovah. Let us proceed to quote a few passages from the inspired writings to shew that the incommunicable perfections of God, his works and worship, are all ascribed to the blessed Jesus. To God only belongs universal presence. 1 Kings 8. 27. Jesus says of himself Matth. 18, 20. 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them. Unchangeableness is incommunicable to any creature, this as well as creation is attributed to Jesus Christ. Heb 1st. 10, 11, 12 "And thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hand, they shall perish but thou remainest, and they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed, but thou art **THE SAME.**" None but he who is omniscient can know the hearts of men. Rev. 2. 18, 22. These things saith the son of God who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire. All the churches shall know that I am he who searcheth the reins and hearts, and I will give to every one of you according to your works.

The Apostle John tells us, That Jesus Christ is the true God. 1 Ep. 5, 20. And we are in him that is true, even in his son Jesus Christ. This is the **TRUE GOD** and Eternal Life.

Paul informs us he is God over all and blessed for ever. Rom. 9, 5. Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came who is **OVER ALL GOD BLESSED FOR EVER**, Amen. In his epistle to Titus, he exhorts him to encourage believing servants to adorn the doctrine of the Gospel, by fidelity to their trust from the consideration, That they have an interest in the blessed hope, and are warranted to expect the glorious appearance of the **GREAT GOD** and (or even) our Saviour Jesus Christ. Titus 2, 13. And Jude tells us he is the only wise God. Jude 25. To the **ONLY WISE GOD OUR SAVIOUR** be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen

To God only supreme worship belongs. Jesus himself tells us, John 5, 23. It is the will of him that sent him, that all men should honour the Son, **EVEN AS** they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him. Baptism is a primary act of homage. It is the devoting of soul and body to God. If Jesus is not God as well as his Father, then he commands and we are guilty of idolatry in devoting ourselves or our offspring to a man along with God the Father. Baptize, that is, consecrate or devote to The Father, to The Son, and to the holy Ghost. If

Jesus were not omnipotent and omnipresent, How could Stephen full of the holy Ghost have committed his departing spirit into his hands, saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit? Acts 7, 59.

From these passages, with many others which might be easily quoted, the candid reader is left to judge for himself of the force of the argument of Rationalis, or rather the truth of this assertion, Namely, that our Lord's divinity was never so much as thought of by any of the Prophets of the Old Testament, or Apostles of the New.

In page 10, Rationalis proceeds to state other objections to the divinity of our blessed Redeemer in the following manner:

"How could Jesus Christ have suffered death
 "had he been God? How could he have been
 "so highly exalted as the reward of his suffer-
 "ings and death? Can the ever blessed God be
 "made happier or more highly exalted than he
 "has been from all eternity? Or is his glory,
 "being, and perfections capable of augmenta-
 "tion, or liable to suffering, diminution, or de-
 "cay, or can he merit or receive any reward
 "from any other being? Can the supreme Lord
 "and Creator of All, the fountain of life and of
 "all being, and who fills all space, be circum-
 "scribed within the bounds of mortality? Be born
 "of a woman, or assume the shape and dwell
 "in the body of a man? And be subject to hun-
 "ger and thirst, to weariness and want, and
 "all the other concomitants of frail humanity,
 "and even to sufferings and death."

To these objections it may be sufficient to answer in a summary manner. We agree with Rationalis that Jesus Christ did not suffer as God, nor was he exalted as God, nor can he be made happier as God than he was from all eternity. Nor is his glory, being, or perfections as God capable of augmentation, or liable to suffering diminution or decay. As God he can receive no reward from any being that can add to his happiness. Nor is it possible that the supreme Lord and creator of all can AS SUCH be circumscribed within the bounds of mortality, or be born of a woman, or be subject to hunger and thirst, to weariness and want.

Rationalis betrays either gross ignorance, or abominable dissimulation in supposing that it implies these obvious impossibilities. But we believe what it is impossible for him or any other man to disprove, that the holy scriptures inform us that Jesus is God and man in one person; and, therefore, it is warrantable to say though as God he is incapable of the particulars mentioned, yet he who is God was born as man, suffered as man, was exalted, and rewarded as man.

To use the words of Rationalis, none but an ignorant recluse vapouring in his cell can imagine that God should be changed from his divine nature into the shape of a man: But that God is capable of assuming the shape of a man we learn from different passages of scripture. And that he dwelt in Christ we have the indisputable authority of the Apostle Paul. Col.

2. 9. For in him dwelleth the fulness of the, Godhead bodily.

Rationalis has another argument against the divinity of Jesus Christ in page 22, expressed in the following words, "If Jesus had been God, where would have been his merit, or where would have been his triumph? Would it have been any thing wonderful or extraordinary if the Almighty had risen superior to human trials and sufferings and with what propriety could he have been proposed as a pattern to man? Had Christ been of a superior order, and of a different nature from man, how could his virtues and sufferings have been consistently or rationally held out to us as a perfect example for our imitation and conduct; and what part or interest could we be reasonably supposed to have in such a Saviour?"

Answer. If Jesus had not been God he could have had neither merit nor triumph. No merit because though merit in a loose sense means the moral worth that is in the dispositions or notions of men, yet in that strict sense in which it can be available to God in behalf of others, it means that intrinsic worth in obedience or suffering that deserves on the footing of rigid justice to be rewarded, and claims that for which it is given as a right, being purchased with an adequate price. No triumph, because without victory there could be no ground for triumph, and without merit in the last sense of the word it was impossible there could be victory, because

God the Father stood inflexibly fixed on having the claims of his justice satisfied for the injuries done him by the sins of his people. The throne of grace stands on the immutable foundations of justice and judgment. Though, therefore, in the perfect obedience of a moral agent there is merit in the first sense of that word that is, innate excellency, beauty, and loveliness that cannot but be pleasing to him that is infinite moral excellency itself, and the fountain from whence it flows into the hearts and lives of all that are the subjects of it; yet as all obedience from mere creatures is only giving God his own, Christ himself teaches us to consider such not as meritorious before God, but only on the humble footing of unprofitable servants. Lu. 17, 10. But the divinity of Jesus stamped infinite worth on every act of his life, and on every painful sensation of his heart, on every groan he heaved, and on every tear he shed, in so much that on this ground God proclaims himself not gracious only but just, also in pardoning and receiving into his favour true believers in Jesus. Rom. 3, 25. Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God. To declare I say at this time his righteousness that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

It is admitted that it would be neither wonderful nor extraordinary for the Almighty to rise superior to human trials and sufferings. For

what is it to which omnipotence must not be superior, but it is believed by Christians to be becoming the most enlightened and the best cultivated understandings to think it very wonderful and extraordinary indeed. That the Almighty, the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last, should take a body and soul into such intimate union with himself as in them to undergo human trials and sufferings. Be astonished O ye heavens at this, and wonder O earth! Nor can it be shewn upon any principles of good reasoning, that admitting him to be God, it would be irrational to propose his conduct as an example for his followers, unless it be true that a perfect pattern is an improper standard for us to copy after. At any rate Rationalis cannot fairly argue in this manner, without abandoning the support of the wisdom of Jesus, seeing it is an undoubted fact that he proposed the perfect example of our heavenly Father as a pattern for our imitation. Matth. 5, 48. Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father who is in heaven is perfect.

We have the next argument of Rationalis in the 29th page of Strictures from the top, Thus;
 "If it were possible for any being to be composed of the divine and human natures incorporated and blended together, he would be a new kind of creature, a phenomenon in the universe, such a being as was never before heard of, and of which we can have no conception or idea. He would neither be God

"nor Angel nor man, but an assemblage of diffi-
 "milar and discordant principles. where each
 "would contend for the superiority, and where
 "each must predominate in its turn, or else the
 "one be totally deposed or subverted by the
 "other. Such a being would be of qualities so
 "incongruous of properties, and propensions so
 "repugnant and hostile the one to the other,
 "that instead of order and harmony and peace,
 "contrariety, confusion, and anarchy must ne-
 "cessarily prevail, until the inconsistent and un-
 "natural union were dissolved by a separation
 "of principles, or a deprivation of existence."

To these objections it is obvious to reply. If
 by the divine and human natures being blended
 together, Rationalis means the divine nature be-
 ing any way changed into the human, or the
 human into the divine, then we agree with him
 that this would be a phenomenon in the uni-
 verse of being of which we can have no idea. But
 why does Rationalis state impossibilities of this
 kind as implied in the doctrine of the Godhead of
 our Lord Jesus Christ. Our doctrine is not bur-
 thened with these, and therefore we cry out in
 the great name of eternal truth. Misrepresentation!
 misrepresentation! injustice! injustice! It
 is only besitting the hectic brain of An Irration-
 alis to suppose such an incorporation or blend-
 ing together. We christians hold this to be im-
 possible in the nature of things, and blasphemy to
 assert. God must from his perfect nature con-
 tinue eternally and infinitely different from and
 above the most exalted of his creatures. Though

therefore the Man Christ Jesus is exalted far above all principalities and powers, yet he doth and must forever continue at an infinite distance (in respect of perfection) from deity.

But if by incorporated and blended Rationalis means united so as though each nature continues different, yet both are joined so intimately as to constitute one person, then we say that the same Authorities on which he goes for proving Christ's humanity, prove also his divinity, and therefore no assertions without evidence either from the nature of things or experience, ought to be sustained in argument against it.

In this view it is false to say he would neither be God nor man. He must be God by a necessity of nature, and he is and will be man forever by his Father's appointment, and his own gracious undertaking. As God he took the seed of Abraham into union with himself. Heb. 2, 16. And as, God and man, he will continue for ever. Heb. 7, 24. This is authority of infinitely more weight to shew that God and man can continue in one person in perfect harmony, than all the bare assertions of either ignorant recluses vapouring in their cells, or irrational blasphemers of Jesus Christ to the contrary. The truth is, so far as our reasonings are warranted by analogy our conclusions ought to be in direct opposition to those of Rationalis. It is true we have no examples of different intelligent creatures being united; but in our own frame we have an example of natures united more distant in themselves

than intelligent created natures. A difference in kind. But though dissimilar they are not discordant. They dont in fact contend for superiority till the one is totally suppressed or subverted by the other. On the contrary, instead of being hostile to one another they harmonize. And though spirit is not only superior to matter, but is conscious of this superiority, yet it neither seeks a dissolution of the union, nor a deprivation of existence to that matter which is so inferior, and to which it is united. We are therefore warranted on the clearest principles of philosophy, on the evidence of analogy, on the certainty of fact, and infallible revelation to pronounce; This reasoning of Rationalis is FALSE.

I have now considered the Arguments of Rationalis against the doctrine of the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ contained in his Scriptures, &c. No doubt there are particular expressions of which I have taken no notice, not because they are any way more difficult to answer than those I have mentioned, but because they appeared to me to belong to one or other of the Arguments I have stated. I have attempted at least a refutation of them with a sacred regard to the evidence of truth contained in the holy scriptures, how far my answers are solid and conclusive every reader must judge for himself.

I proceed to shew in a concise manner, the unscriptural nature of the other positions interspersed by Rationalis in his performance that seem worthy of notice.

According to this author 'Infinite goodness will not suffer any of his creatures to be finally lost, much less to be for ever miserable. And as for the human race, a man he says is to reign till he bring every one of them to virtue and happiness, for proof of which 1 Cor. 15, 25 is quoted, For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.'

It was the Devil who said to our first parents that though they sinned they should not die. Men do his work who represent God as making no eternal distinctions between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not, though God himself hath declared that he will. This is doing what a man is able to throw open the flood gates to all manner of deceit, villainy, and impiety, and to make even God of the infernal party. The divine goodness is not a blind undistinguishing benignity of heart, but an infinite disposition to communicate of his fulness for making his creatures happy, directed by infinite intelligence and perfect wisdom, and bounded by the eternal barriers of inflexible justice and unspotted holiness. Let it only be supposed that God had intended to tell men that the wicked are to be forever miserable; I ask by what language could he express this to men, other than that which is used to express his own eternal existence. The supreme Judge has done so, Matth. 25, 41. Depart from me ye cursed into **EVERLASTING** fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels. To the same awful purpose are the following words of the faithful witness.

Rev. 21, 11. He that is unjust let him be unjust STILL, and he which is filthy let him be filthy STILL, and he that is righteous let him be righteous STILL, and he that is holy let him be holy STILL. This is the full import of Christ's reigning till he hath put all enemies under his feet.

Rationalis would have us also to believe 'The doctrines of original sin, vicarious punishment, atonement for sin, are absurd notions. The eternity of hell torments horrid. Predestination and reprobation still more shocking: All flowing he says from ignorance, and thinking and believing, just as our nurses and grand-mothers have taught us; or as our priests or pastors have thought and believed for us.' At present it must suffice to confront Rationalis with a few sacred authorities on these points, and then the reader must judge for himself who hath truth on his side.

Rationalis. Original sin is an absurd notion.

Apostle Paul, Rom. 5, 18. By the offence of one, judgment came upon ALL MEN to condemnation.

Rationalis. Election and reprobation are shocking doctrines.

Apostle Paul, Rom. 9, 18. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. That is, among sinful men who deserve damnation he pardons whom he will, and punishes whom he will.

Rationalis. Vicarious punishment is an absurd notion.

Apostle Peter, 1 Ep. 3, 18. For Christ also

hath once suffered for sins the Just FOR THE UNJUST. Apostl. Paul, Gal. 3, 13. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse FOR US.

Rationalis. Atonement is an absurd notion.

Apostle John 1st Ep. 4, 10. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his son to be the PROPITIATION for our sins.

Rationalis. The eternity of hell torments is a shocking doctrine.

Jesus Christ, Matth. 25, 46. And these shall go away into EVERLASTING punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.

I proceed to point out some of the uses that may be made of what we have wrote in defence of the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

One use is to consider the divinity of Christ as an essential doctrine of the Christian religion. A man may be a Mahometan, a Jew, or a Heathen, though he do not believe in the deity of Christ, but a Christian he cannot be. John 5, 22, 23. The Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son EVEN AS they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, HONOURETH NOT the Father that sent him. Philosophers who form their notions of God from nature, and not from revelation, are in great danger of believing one person only in the Godhead, from the consideration of that unity of design to which they imagine they per-

ceive all things finally to tend. And they suppose also that this scheme is incumbered with fewer difficulties than the doctrine of the Father, Son, and Spirit in a unity of nature. But most certainly The All intelligent LIGHT of the world, The SUN of righteousness is a much safer guide in divine subjects, than blind nature. And it is surely much wiser to follow the unerring teacher, than to grope in the dark if haply we may feel after God. "For no man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him." Oh! that Rationalis and all of his opinion would take the advice of the Apostle Paul on this subject. Col. 2, 8, 9. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth ALL the fulness of the Godhead bodily. If they do not, in the charity of a Christian, I beseech them deeply to weigh the awful import of the following words. 1 John 2, 23. Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ. He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. And again, if ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins. John 8, 24.

How worthy is the love of the Father in the gift of his only begotten Son of our highest admiration and adoring gratitude. To us is born in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the

Lord. Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, good will to men.

How worthy is the Son of God of our highest adoration, and thankful praise, who though he was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God (that is the Father) yet condescended to take upon him the form of a servant, to be found in fashion as a man, and to become obedient to death, even the death of the cross. O the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of the love of Christ, it passeth knowledge!

How deeply indebted are all real Christians to the holy Ghost, who, while others are left in righteous judgment to contradict and blaspheme, have this love of God in the true perception of it, in the just impression of it, and in the suitable returns of it shed abroad on their heart by his almighty agency.

Again, Ye men of reason and philosophy who choose to give me a candid hearing, be ye the judges between Rationalis and believers in the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ which look most like enthusiasts, bigots, hectic brained recluses, natural ideots, and persons who believe just as hurses god mothers, and grand-mothers have taught them. (For these and such as these are the honourable epithets which this enlightened, polite, and charitable Author bestows on us). According then to this mighty champion, who boastingly throws the gauntlet and challenges Mr Johnson, to confute him if he can Jesus is

only a man, and the holy scriptures are his authority in proof. Now let us see some of the consequences. This man is perfect, and yet he claims divine honours. Obedient to God his Father, and yet robs him of his honour. A man only, and yet uses and receives the incommunicable name Jehovah. A man only, and yet the creator of all things. A man only, and yet present every where supporting all things. A man only, and yet God the Father commanding all his angels to worship him. A man only, (at best but an unprofitable servant) and yet worth in his sacrifice, and virtue in his obedience to propitiate his Father, save his people, and purchase heaven. A man only, and yet searching the hearts of the whole human race, raising the dead, making a perfect distinction of characters, and rewarding every man according to his works. Ye judges; What an accumulation of impossibilities, blasphemies, and contradictions is here! Must he not be God as well as man to whom these glories of right belong?

We now proceed a step further than we did in answering the first argument of Rationalists, and affirm, That it was Jehovah the son of the Father, who was the Lord or king of Israel, when that people returned from their captivity. From the time God had a holy hill in Zion, that is, a church on earth, Jesus was their king by the appointment of his Father. Ps. 2, 6. Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. He was the Lord or king of David, who ruled

the people of Israel under him some hundreds of years before Jesus was born of Mary. This was the King the Lord of hosts, as we have proved, whose glory Esaus saw. This was the king who anointed Cyrus to open the two leaved gates of Babylon to set his captives at liberty, as appears by comparing several verses of the 45 of Isaiah, with passages in the new; particularly the four last verses, with Rom. 10, 11, 12. Be it then that Rationalis is in the right, in saying, that the 147 Ps. was composed by Nehemiah and Ezra to celebrate the praises of Jehovah for delivering Israel from their captivity, still it must be understood to mean that Son of the Father who was their king. Mr Johnson therefore was warranted on the justest principles of criticism to take the 5 ver. of this Ps. as a text for grounding the doctrine of the Divinity of our Saviour upon. Are preachers not to bring forth the fruits of deep research into the holy scriptures and fair conclusion, because a chance ignorant conceited blasphemer happens to be his hearer?

Go on, Mr Johnson, to merit the esteem of the intelligent, the judicious, the wise and good, by continuing to preach in defiance of reproach, That Jesus is the TRUE God and eternal life. And let us drop the tear of tender compassion over poor Rationalis (who seems to be better acquainted with the flimsy disquisitions of Dr. Priestly on this subject, than the divine fountain of revelation) if God peradventure will give him repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth.

ERRATA.

- Page 5th line 10th, for *unmad*, read *unmade*.
- Ditto line 11th, for *ot*, read *not*.
- Page 7th line 10th, for *arg ment*, read *argument*.
- Ditto line 6th from the bottom, for *at*, read *as*.
- Page 9th line 6th from the bottom, for *was* read *is*.
- Ditto line 4th from the bottom, for *was* read *is*.
- Page 10th line 7th, for *was* read *is*.
- Page 14th line 5th, for *status*, read *stature*.
- Page 20th line 1st, for *him*, read *himself*.
- Ditto line 4th from the bottom, for *or*, read *not*.
- Page 21st line 5th from the bottom, for *covered* read *covered*.
- Page 26th line 5th from the bottom, for *recl ufe*, read *recluse*.
- Page 27th line 19th, for *consistently*, read *consistently*.
- Page 28th line 4th from the bottom, omit *that*.
- Page 32d line 10th, for *exisfeme*, read *existence*.